



2643

#15
smc
8/6/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : George Nichols et al.
Serial No. : 09/458,248
Filed : December 9, 1999
Title : AUTOMOBILE PILLAR ELECTROACOUSTICAL TRANSDUCING

Art Unit : 2643
Examiner : Suhan Ni

RECEIVED

AUG 06 2003

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Technology Center 2600

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Commissioner

Responsive to the office action dated July 1, 2003, application owner respectfully traverses the requirement for restriction and provisionally elects claims 1-24 in Group II drawn to an acoustic structures/structural elements of an A-pillar for an automobile for further prosecution in this application should the requirement be made final.

35 U.S.C. §121 reads, "If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions." Thus, restriction is proper only if the inventions are "independent and distinct." M.P.E.P. headed 802.01, "Meaning of 'Independent', 'Distinct' reads as follows:

INDEPENDENT

The term "independent" (i.e., not dependent) means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, that is, they are unconnected in design, operation or effect, for example, (1) species under a genus which species are not usable together as disclosed or (2) process and apparatus incapable of being used in practicing the process.

DISTINCT

The term "distinct" means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, for example as combination and part (subcombination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc., but are capable of separate

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

AUG -1 2003

Date of Deposit

Signature

Charles Hickman

Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

manufacture, use or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable because of the prior art). It will be noted that in this definition the term "related" is used as an alternative for "dependent" in referring to subjects other than independent subjects.

The Examiner has not shown that the claims in each group "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER." Should the requirement for restriction be made final, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rule that the claims in each Group "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER."

The Examiner has made no showing whatsoever that the inventions are INDEPENDENT. M.P.E.P. 803 provides, "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

And M.P.E.P. 803.01 provides, "IT STILL REMAINS IMPORTANT FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT NO REQUIREMENTS BE MADE WHICH MIGHT RESULT IN THE ISSUANCE OF TWO PATENTS FOR THE SAME INVENTION.

Manifestly, search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden because prior art related to the acoustic structures/structural elements of an A pillar for an automobile in Group II must be searched in connection with examining the claims in Group I drawn to acoustic structures/structural elements of a pillar for an automobile.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has also recognized that "independent and distinct" means "independent and distinct." *In re Weber*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 328 (C.C.P.A. 1978); *In re Haas*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 334, 336 (C.C.P.A. 1978).

In a decision dated June 23, 1977, on a petition filed June 13, 1977, Group 1210 Director Alfred L. Leavitt in granting the petition to withdraw the requirement for restriction said:

Current Office policy is not to require restriction between related inventions when no substantial burden is involved in the examination of all claims in a single application.

And in a decision dated 3 December 1993 on a petition filed March 12, 1993, Group 1100 Deputy Director John Doyle said:

Restriction was required between (I) method for epitaxial deposition and (II) epitaxially deposited product (Paper No. 4). However, the examiner failed to present any convincing basis for the holding that the inventions as above grouped are distinct. The claimed inventions must be independent or distinct, and the examiner "must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions . . .". Further, the field of search for the alleged distinct inventions is seen to be coextensive, hence, no serious burden is seen to be incurred by examination of all pending claims. MPEP 803 under "Criteria For Restriction Between Patentably Distinct Inventions".

The Petition is GRANTED.

That claims 1-24 are directed to an acoustic structures/structural elements of an A-pillar for an automobile, classified in class 381, subclass 389 and the other claims include the acoustic structures/structural elements of a pillar for an automobile, classified in class 381, subclass 86 has nothing to do with the requirements of establishing that the groups are both independent and distinct and that search and examination of the entire application cannot be made without serious burden.

Manifestly, search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden because prior art related to the Group I claims are likely to disclose subject matter related to the remaining claims 25-29, which must be searched in connection with examining claims 1-24.

Furthermore, this application has been pending since December 9, 1999, all the claims have been examined through filing the appeal brief, demonstrating beyond a reasonable doubt that claims 25-29 can be examined with claims 1-24 without serious burden.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn. If the requirement for restriction is repeated, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rule that the claims in each group ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER and explain why all the claims cannot be examined without serious burden.

Applicant : George Nichols et
Serial No. : 09/458,248
Filed : December 9, 1999
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket #: 02103-365001 / AABOSS09

No fee is believed to be due. However, the Commissioner is respectfully requested to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, Order No. 02103-365001.

Respectfully submitted,

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

Date: AUG -1 2003

Charles Hieken
Charles Hieken
Reg. No. 18,411

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906